REMARKS

In an Office Action dated July 13, 2005, the Examiner: (1) objected to the Specification; (2) objected to claims 1, 3, 8, and 10 because of informalities; (3) rejected claims 1, 2, and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over a combination of Kelkar et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,663,991) and Boateng (U.S. Pat. No. 6,642,701); (4) rejected claims 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over a combination of Kelkar and Boateng and further in view of Delmas (U.S. Pat. No. 6,731,681); and (5) objected to claims 3, 4, 8, and 9 as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but otherwise allowable.

By this Amendment, Applicants amend the Specification to overcome the objection to the Specification. Applicants further cancel claims 3 and 10 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof. Applicants also amend claims 1, 4, and 8.

As indicated above, Applicants have amended the Specification to overcome the Examiner's objection to the Specification. In particular, Applicants are replacing the word "Claims" on page 12, line 1 with --What is Claimed is:--. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to the Specification.

With respect to the objection to claims 1, 3, 8, and 10, Applicants have amended pending claims 1 and 8. Applicants believe that these claims now do not have any informalities identified by the Examiner, and accordingly Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to pending claims 1 and 8.

Concerning the rejection of pending claims 1, 2, and 5-7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over combinations of various references, Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to include the subject matter of claim 3, which the Examiner indicated as being allowable. Thus, for at least this reason, claim 1 is now allowable over the cited references. Claims 2 and 5-7 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1 and are thus patentable for at least this reason.

Regarding the objection to claims 8 and 9, Applicants have amended claim 8 to include the limitations of the base claim and thus claims 8 and 9 are now in a condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the objection to claims 8 and 9.

Finally, Applicants have canceled claim 10 and thus the rejection of claim 10 is now moot.

Accordingly, Applicants request allowance of pending claims 1, 2, 4-9 over the cited references. Should issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned at (512) 996-6839.

If Applicants have overlooked any additional fees, or if any overpayment has been made, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit or debit Deposit Account 503079, Freescale Semiconductor, Inc.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Freescale Semiconductor, Inc. Law Department

Customer Number: 23125

Ranjeev Singh

Attorney of Record

Reg. No.: 47,093

Telephone: (512) 996-6839

Fax No.:

(512) 996-6854